

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF NORTH CAROLINA
SOUTHERN DIVISION

Case No. 7:25-CV-00048-M

PAMELA MELVIN,

Plaintiff,

v.

JOSEPH BIDEN, et al.,

Defendants.

ORDER

This matter comes before the court on a series of motions filed by Plaintiff: a Rule 60 motion for relief from this court's August 7, 2025 order, requesting "\$4 million as part of the damages of this Court's non-judicial acts, conspiracy, forgery, atrocities, and terror," DE 81, a motion requesting that the court provide Plaintiff with "a new car, iPhone, Mac computer, water heater, [and] a Brinks smoke alarm or \$30,900.00," DE 83, and a motion for monetary damages, DE 84. For the foregoing reasons, these motions are denied as moot.

Underlying these motions is Plaintiff's complaint requesting relief from an alleged "black operation to force the deaths of ill and disabled U.S. Armed Forces veterans" instituted by the Department of Veterans Affairs to "reduce the U.S. government's budget and debt." Compl. at 4. Following the matter's removal from state court to federal court, on April 4, 2025, Plaintiff filed a "Motion for Voluntary Dismissal Without Prejudice." DE 53. In her motion, Plaintiff indicated that she wished to re-file her claim in state court. *See* DE 53 at 1-2. Accordingly, on April 14, 2025, this court granted Plaintiff's motion, dismissed the action without prejudice pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 41(a)(1)(A)(i), and directed the Clerk of the Court to close the case. DE 58. The case

was subsequently closed. Plaintiff, explicitly, “[did] not request a reconsideration of the order’s ‘dismissal without prejudice.’” DE 62 at 1.

Following the dismissal of this action and closure of the case, Plaintiff filed nine motions, which, on August 7, 2025, this court dismissed. DE 80. In its order, the court explained that Plaintiff’s motions were rendered moot by virtue of the closure of the case following Plaintiff’s motion to dismiss. DE 80. For those same reasons, the court DENIES AS MOOT the present motions. DE 81, 83, & 84. Alternatively, after reviewing each of Plaintiff’s motions, the court finds that they lack any basis in law or fact and denies them. Plaintiff is reminded that this case is closed; the court has denied and will continue to deny all post-closure motions filed in this matter.

SO ORDERED this 8th day of October, 2025.



RICHARD E. MYERS II
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE